55375-1-1

NEW JERSEY JUDICIARY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ANNUAL REPORT
1991 - 92
1992 - 93

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
STATE OF NEW JERSEY

ROBERT D. LIPSCHER
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COURTS

RICHARD J. HUGHES
JUSTICE COMPLEX
CN-037
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

To: Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz
Justice Robert L Clifford
Justice Alan B. Handler
Justice Stewart G. Pollock
Justice Daniel J. O'Hern
Justice Marie L. Garibaldi
Justice Gary S. Stein

I hereby present the Annual Report of the New Jersey Judiciary and the Administrative Office of the Courts for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 court years.

We have this year simplified our format. The report contains a statewide and county-by-county examination of our caseloads, and a section on finances. The report is introduced by a recitation of a few of the highlights in court administration during the two years covered. The greatest single event during that period was the move toward state funding of the trial courts. We are proud of our preparation for that change and of the numerous efforts we have made to better our service for the people of the State of New Jersey.

In a report of this size, we realize that a lot has been left out regarding the outstanding contributions by all involved in the court system, from judges to court staff, from members of the bar to volunteers. All of them make the system work. All of them are worthy of our deep appreciation. They are the ones who have kept the New Jersey Judiciary focused on its most important task -- providing justice for those who seek it.

Robert D Lipscher

Robert D. Lipscher

Overview

STATE FUNDING OF THE COURTS: THE TIME IS AT HAND

On June 8, 1992, in an appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Chief Justice Robert Wilentz called state funding of the trial courts "by far the greatest reform and improvement of the judiciary since the Constitution of 1947. It will give us a chance to make a good judiciary great. We can't do it under the present system."

The Chief Justice was testifying in favor of a resolution that would place before the voters of the state a constitutional amendment to require state funding of the courts. The resolution passed by a vote of 30 to 3 in the Senate and 71 to 6 in the Assembly. At the general election in November 1992, the voters endorsed the idea 1,446,117 to 1,015,989.

Specifically, the voters approved an amendment to Article VI of the Constitution requiring the state, in the words of the ballot question, "to assume by July 1, 1997, certain costs of the court system borne by the counties through the county property tax levy."

In large measure, the vote brought to reality a dream long held by judicial reformers. But it also brought to the judiciary -- and, particularly, its administrative arm, the Administrative Office of the Courts -- the enormous task of implementing the constitutional change, under which approximately 8,000 county-paid employees will become employees of the state.

Arguably, the anticipation and reality of the change to state funding was the dominant issue in court years 1991-92 and 1992-93 within the AOC. In upcoming years, it will be no less dominant. From a narrow perspective, state funding simply moves the fiscal responsibility for the trial courts from the county property taxpayer to the state taxpayer. In reality, it changes much more: The operation of the trial courts will be fundamentally altered.

"Poised to move ahead"

Under the structure that existed at the time of the vote, counties provided all trial court staff -- except for judges, a few members of their immediate staff, and court reporters.

In his June 1992 statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Chief Justice noted that the 1947 Constitution "left untouched ... a gaping hole in the fabric of a true state court system, for each county continued to rely on its own clerical and record-keeping systems, security system, case-processing and case-management system, management-information system, personnel system, and budget-and-finance system. And that continues to some extent today, for the counties still pay those who do the judiciary's work at the trial level, still control many of them, ... and still determine the courts' budgets.

"The result of that gaping hole, the result of that economic power, plus centuries of tradition, is 21 different systems, each resistant to change in varying degrees."

He added, "This constitutional amendment comes at a critical point, for we are poised, not because of it, but because of developments within our own judiciary, poised to move ahead in our management, our management of personnel, our management of the caseload and the processing of all matters. Over these past 10 years we have learned what works and what does not, and what works best.

"We have reached a consensus within the judiciary for use of those techniques, structures, and organizations that will result, we believe, in very substantial improvements in case management. We are ready to implement them. At the very heart of these improvements are conclusions about the number of staff needed and the more effective and more extensive use of staff. ...

"It simply will not work if the number of support personnel supplied by a county and assigned to a court division falls far short of what is needed; ... it will not work if some report to the County Clerk and others to the judiciary; it will not work right if the judicial organization in each county must differ in order to adapt itself to whatever happens to be the differing resources and differing systems of that county," he said.

"The time has come to establish one system in the state, ... a system that incorporates what we have found works best. ... We know it cannot happen, however, without a rational statewide budgeting system."

"As far as I am concerned, the greatest benefit of this constitutional amendment is its promise of giving us a truly well-managed judiciary for the benefit of our citizens. It will give them better justice," he said, adding, "The constitutional amendment will finally, for the first time in our history, start to bring equal justice to all of our citizens. ... Ultimately, we will move to where we ought to be: the same standard of justice everywhere in New Jersey, whether the county be rich or poor, and no matter where the litigant lives or where the case is filed."

Challenge of implementation

The vision of efficiency and equal justice as spelled out by the Chief Justice was joined to the idea -- trumpeted by county officials across the state -- of property tax relief. The counties, quite simply, had had enough of paying for the courts. If they didn't have to foot the bill, property taxes would not have to be maintained at the same level. In fact, they were to be rolled back dollar-for-dollar by the amount the counties would save by having the state pick up the tab.

The bill under which the constitutional amendment was to be effected originally proposed that state funding of the trial courts begin July 1, 1993, with the counties contributing a diminishing portion of the costs back to the state each year until July 1, 1997, at which point they would no longer contribute. The date for the phase-in to start, however, was eventually changed to January 1, 1995. Also, the Legislature decided to handle personnel-related issues separately from the first piece of legislation.

Labor issues have been complicated by the fact that court employees on the county level are represented by approximately 70 negotiations units. However, as of early 1994, areas of agreement were reached by AOC officials and representatives of the units, which had formed into an group known as the Judiciary Alliance of Labor Organizations. The agreements were to be reflected in the proposed legislation dealing specifically with personnel issues.

On December 6, 1993, Gov. Jim Florio signed the state-funding implementation legislation at a ceremony attended by Chief Justice Wilentz. In his remarks, the Chief Justice hailed the new law as "the beginning of a new period in the life of a great judiciary."

Within the AOC and in the state's 15 judicial vicinages, planning for state funding has been proceeding apace. The vision remains bright, despite the enormity of the task. The details of the change could be daunting to some organizations. Each category of work presents its own challenges, from equalization of services and staffing to gaining control over the various budgeting practices in order to maximize efficiency.

Key to making the change to state funding are the court employees. The AOC will be seeking to tap the talents of all staff in innovative ways, including cooperative "team" approaches to managing cases that encourage problem-solving.

State funding of the trial courts was reflected in the 1994-95 state budget proposal submitted to the Legislature by Gov. Christine Todd Whitman. As the implementation legislation promised, state funding will indeed kick in on January 1, 1995. With it, a new era will begin.

IMPROVING COURT CALENDARS: CALENDAR CLEARANCE AND BACKLOG REDUCTION

In September 1990, the backlog of Criminal Division cases -- post-indictment cases more than four months old -- reached a high of almost 16,000 cases. That level represented about one-third of a year's filings in the division. By June 1993, however, that backlog was reduced to 7,000 cases, an improvement of 56 percent.

But the increased attention on criminal cases had an adverse impact on civil. In June 1991, the civil backlog -- General Civil cases more than a year old -- was about 62,000 cases. By November 1992, the backlog had grown to almost 87,000 cases -- a number equivalent to 60 percent of a year's filings. But then the backlog started to diminish, as new case-management programs and additional judges started to have an effect. By June 30, 1993, there were 77,189 civil cases in backlog, a decline of 11 percent in the last seven months of the 1992-93 court year.

Those improved backlogs highlight a healthier trial court calendar. After five consecutive years of failing to clear the calendar, the courts have cleared the calendar in each of the last two years. Calendar clearance means that the number of terminations exceeds the number of filings, so that the courts are at least keeping up with their workload. In the 1991-92 court year, clearance was very close; terminations exceeded filings by 5,340 cases. In 1992-93, it was not so close; there were 26,483 more terminations than filings. As a result, the number of active pending cases declined by 7 percent during the 1992-93 court. Below is a table on all trial court caseloads.

CASELOAD	1991-92	1992-93
Filings	1,015,578	968,859
Terminations	1,020,918	995,342
Clearance	5,340	26,483
Clearance %	101%	103%
Active Pending Cases at end of year	326,149	302,152

The reasons for the improved calendar are clear: more judges, level or declining filings, and better management.

In June 1993, there were 367 sitting Superior Court trial judges, compared to 323 sitting judges in June of 1991. The increase in judges has enabled the Judiciary to apply resources to the civil caseloads while maintaining the level of judges needed in the Criminal Division and increasing the judges available in the Family Division, especially to attend to the burgeoning needs in domestic-violence cases.

Trial-court filings have been stable or declining in the last two years, with at least one notable exception. In the 1991-92 court year, filings dropped 7 percent from the previous year to 1,015,578. The decline continued in the 1992-93 court year with a 5 percent drop to 968,859 filings. Civil Division filings have declined by 17 percent, criminal by 13 percent, and special civil by 16 percent from the 1990-91 court year to 1992-93. In the Family Division, dissolution cases have declined by less than 1 percent and delinquency cases declined by 8 percent from the 1990-91 court year to 1992-93, but domestic violence caseloads increased by 33 percent during the same period.

In dealing with caseloads, however, the greatest changes have been in more active case management.

Criminal

Backlog reduction came about through the leadership of Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz and the hard work of judges and staff at both the state and vicinage levels. The accomplishment was all the more impressive in light of the nation's drug epidemic and the related rise in criminal cases.

Much of the progress can be traced to recommendations made in 1990 by a special committee appointed by the Chief Justice to assess Criminal Division needs. The Chief Justice implemented the committee's report with the assignment of additional judges to the Criminal Division. Federal grant money helped pay for prosecutors and public defenders to handle the load.

For its part, the judiciary responded by implementing effective case-management strategies designed to eliminate meaningless court events. During the 1991-92 court year, with the input of the bar, operating standards for the Criminal Division were developed and approved by the Conference of Criminal Presiding Judges, receiving Supreme Court approval in October 1992.

Those standards call for all events in a criminal case to be handled by the same judge with the help of a management team, meaningfully scheduled court events, a cut-off date for pleas and trial-date certainly. Implementation of the standards is ongoing statewide with two-thirds of the counties in substantial compliance as of early 1994.

The 1991-92 year also saw the mandatory statewide use of the Uniform Defendant Intake Report covering such matters as pretrial intervention and presentence reports. In addition, the capacity for the courts to assess defendants' drug and alcohol problems was expanded to nine counties by court year 1992-93.

The result of all the initiatives was not only a reduction in the number of cases in backlog, but a drop in the number of all indictments pending. That number was 17,232 statewide as of June 30, 1992 and 16,472 on June 30, 1993. In all, 57,145 indictments were disposed of during the 1991-92 court year, 6,091 more than the 51,054 added. During 1992-93 court year, 49,227 indictments were disposed of, which was 1,269 more that the 47,958 added.

Civil

In the Civil Division, case-management programs have also been developed and expanded. Differentiated Case Management -- under which cases are handled in different tracks depending on their complexity -- was being implemented or approved for use in 11 counties as of early 1994. Expanded programs in Complementary Dispute Resolution are in place in many vicinages, and there is a CDR coordinator in each vicinage to oversee the programs. And in several vicinages, the bar has become more and more involved in handling early settlement conferences.

In addition, uniform standards for the organization and operation of the Civil Division statewide were developed by the Conference of Civil Presiding Judges, given extensive bench and bar review in the vicinages, and approved by the Supreme Court in March 1993. The standards, promulgated in a White Paper, call for:

- early and continuous case management in accordance with individual case needs;
- direct control by the court over all case-management functions and personnel;
- individual judges being responsible for all pretrial events in cases assigned to them;

- elimination of unproductive court events and certainty that court events will be held when scheduled;
- incorporation of Complementary Dispute Resolution programs and other programs to enhance case management; and
- maximum use of the Automated Case Management System.

Taken together, the management improvements in the Civil Division have helped to reduce backlogs and maintain calendar clearance. In the future, as filings again start to increase, the trial courts should be able to increase productivity and remain efficient.

FILLING JUDGESHIPS

On June 29, 1991, Gov. Jim Florio signed P.L. 1991, c. 177. The act created 36 new trial court judgeships, raising the size of the Superior Court by 10 percent, the largest single increase in the modern history of the courts.

As of end of the 1992-93 court year, the Superior Court had only eight vacancies; the courts (Supreme, Superior, and Tax) were 98 percent filled, with 413 out of 421 authorized positions in place. With the sizable influx of new judges, the judiciary worked to train them and to assist them in becoming fully effective as quickly as possible. At Chief Justice Wilentz's direction, the AOC now devotes 10 days to the orientation of new judges. The program includes two days of general matters, two days on handling civil cases, and three days each on criminal cases and on family cases. All aspects of the judges' work are covered -- taught by experienced and highly regarded judges and senior staff. Judges who are sitting for the first time in a particular division of court are strongly encouraged to attend the orientation program for that division. The last two orientation programs have been the biggest ever -- 55 judges attended in 1992 and 51 in 1993.

TRIAL COURT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

New Jersey is one of four states participating in an important national project to find good ways to measure the performance of trial courts. At the conclusion of the multi-year project, there should be accepted and well-tested measurement tools to determine how well trial courts around the country, including in New Jersey, are doing.

From 1987 to 1990, a national commission drafted 22 Trial Court Performance Standards, with commentary. New Jersey is well represented on the commission; its 12 members include Administrative Director Robert D. Lipscher and Essex Vicinage Trial Court Administrator John A. Clarke. The 22 standards are divided into 5 main topics:

1. Access to Justice
2. Expedition and Timeliness
3. Equality, Fairness, and Integrity
4. Independence and Accountability
5. Public Trust and Confidence

Following adoption of the standards, the commission developed and proposed 90 tentative performance measures to assess individual trial courts against the national standards. Those tentative measures include interviews with major stakeholders, statistical analyses, observers noting courtroom events, focus group discussions, opinion surveys, newspapers reviews, and other techniques.

After the tentative measures were proposed, New Jersey, along with Washington, Ohio, and Virginia, agreed to test the measures. Beginning in 1991, five vicinages -- Burlington, Ocean, Morris, Somerset and Atlantic -- tested 43 of the 90 tentative performance measures. They collected the data, conducted the focus groups and interviews, and initiated the surveys and questionnaires called for in the performance measures.

The purpose was not to assess the performance of those vicinages but to validate the measures. New Jersey's vicinages made a number of recommendations for improving the measures. Some were too time-consuming or expensive to be practical. Others did not yield results which were usable, and still others needed some changes in order to be effective. But most of the measures did provide helpful and insightful information on the performance of the trial courts.

In 1993, a second phase of the Trial Court Performance Standards project began. In the second phase, three of the original five vicinages will refine and recommend final performance measures in key areas, especially Access to Justice and Expedition and Timeliness. The three vicinages participating in Phase II are Burlington, Morris, and Ocean.

This project was supported on a national basis by the Bureau of Justice Assistance in the U.S. Department of Justice, and it has been staffed by the National Center for State Courts. The New Jersey tests of the measures themselves have been supported in part by Phase I and Phase II grants from the State Justice Institute. The project director in New Jersey is AOC Deputy Director Theodore J. Fetter, and the leaders of the vicinage-level tests are the trial court administrators in the participating vicinages.

The Trial Court Performance Standards are an important effort to develop practical ways to assess the work of the trial courts. Unlike private sector organizations, there is no "bottom-line" standard of success similar to the amount of profit earned. Trial courts do not even have easily understood qualitative goals, since the overall mission of the court system is less obvious then the mission of most Executive Branch departments and agencies. Nevertheless, the Trial Court Performance Standards, with their commentary and their measurement tools, offer the great promise of a set of clear and articulate goals and objectives for trial courts across the country. Once the testing phase is complete, New Jersey's courts will have the opportunity to use standards that have been accepted nationally with considerable involvement and participation by New Jersey courts and court managers.

FAMILY DIVISION HANDLES DEMANDS

In recent years, a great deal of attention has been directed toward families in crisis. The Legislature has enacted a series of statutes that address the problem. Some of those acts are the Code of Juvenile Justice, which includes mandates concerning juveniles and families in crisis; the Prevention of Domestic Violence Act, the Child Placement Review Act; and the Supervised Visitation Act.

The Executive Branch has also responded to the needs of troubled families by appointing various study groups, including the Governor's Advisory Council on Domestic Violence, the New Jersey Commission on Child Support, the Governor's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect and the Governor's Cabinet Action Group on Juvenile Justice (now the Governor's Advisory Council on Juvenile Justice). Those study groups were charged with recommending appropriate remedies, including legislation to address the needs of families in crisis.

The implementation of those legislative enactments and study group recommendations has strained the resources available to the Family Division. To meet the increased demand and to respond to the intent of the Legislature expressed in the Code of Juvenile Justice to rehabilitate families, the Judiciary has created innovative programs and case-management techniques, keeping in mind that quality and expeditious service to litigants must be preserved. The design and development of those programs has been accomplished with the input of attorneys and other interested parties.

Dispute resolution

Families in crisis must be afforded the attention and services they require. Attempting to meet that need, the Judiciary has sought to implement complementary dispute resolution programs statewide such as mediation for custody or visitation disputes and matrimonial early settlement panels.

Diversionary programs have been established for less-serious juvenile offenses. Cases can be diverted to crisis-intervention units, intake service conferences, Juvenile Conference Committees or programs dealing with specific offenses, such as shoplifting. Those programs enable a significant number of cases to be handled in a way that reduces judicial involvement and fosters families sharing in the resolution process.

The Judiciary employs ongoing efforts to maximize the use of volunteers by using them on Child Placement Review Boards, Juvenile Conference Committees, in its Supervised Visitation program, and as Volunteers in Probation.

Pathfinders

In August 1986, Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz appointed the Pathfinders Committee and gave it a broad mandate "to determine what kinds of problems and opportunities lie ahead for the Family Division" and to recommend an appropriate course for the future. In 1989, the Pathfinders Committee completed its first report (Pathfinders I) assessing the status of the Family Division and recommending goals for its further development.

Among those goals was that uniform policies and practices be developed for statewide use. Following the approval of the first Pathfinders report by the New Jersey Supreme Court, the Pathfinders committee was reconvened and asked to draft principles and operating procedures for the Family Division, based on the recommendations contained in that first report -- and on the best practices then in place in the state.

The Committee, chaired by Judge Robert W. Page, issued its final report (Pathfinders II) on October 1, 1991. The Supreme Court approved the principles contained in it in June 1992.

A set of standards

In a related area, the Judiciary completed work on management and organizational standards for the Family Division. The standards, contained in the *Family Division White Paper,* also called the Operating Standards, were endorsed by the Conference of Family Division Presiding Judges in January 1993, by the Conference of Assignment Judges on February 10, 1993, and were reviewed by both the Family Law Section of the New Jersey State Bar Association and by local bar association family law committees. The *Family Division White Paper* was approved by the Supreme Court in March 1993.

As the Chief Justice stated in his April 11, 1991, memorandum to the chairs of the conferences of civil, criminal and family presiding judges, "The disparity in process, procedure and standards from county to county, vicinage to vicinage, courtroom to courtroom, judge to judge, far exceeds what we now believe to be desirable and workable." The standards contained in the *Family Division White Paper* have been derived from the recommendations made by many study groups over several years. One common theme in those recommendations is that accountability will only be achieved with uniform Family Division management, organization and structure.

The standards detailed in the White Paper call for, among other things:

- leadership from the Assignment Judge, Trial Court Administrator, and Family Division Presiding Judge, with lines of authority and control of teams and work units clearly identifiable;
- the highest quality education and training for Family Division judges and staff;
- a uniform shared record-keeping system to be available statewide for easily retrievable family-based information, with appropriate confidentiality standards met;
- individual calendars to be used in the Family Division. If a judge has had prior, substantial judicial connection with a family, that judge should, if possible, hear later cases involving that family;
- every county to have a domestic-violence working group jointly chaired by the prosecutor and a Family Division judge;
- the Family Division Presiding Judge and division manager to serve on the county youth services commission, which helps coordinate youth policy development, planning, and service delivery; and
- all vicinages to develop plans for upgrading Family Division facilities.

Just the FACTS

An essential element in all the efforts of the Family Division is the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS). FACTS must be in place statewide for the Family Division to successfully implement *Pathfinders I* and *II*, and the *Family Division White Paper*. At least some portion of FACTS is now installed in every county, and FACTS was fully installed in 14 counties as of early 1994.

The Family Division is working toward unification of form and function with flexibility for local needs and resources. It will be concentrated in the 1993-94 court year on implementing its structure statewide, on implementing *Pathfinders I* and *II*, fostering court-community ties, enhancing relations between the courts and state agencies, and improving service to the public.

CHILD-SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

The total child support caseload during the 1992-93 court year was 261,211, comprised of 104,900 public assistance (AFDC) cases and 156,311 non-public assistance (non-AFDC) cases. In addition to the increase in the number of supervised cases, collections improved to $455 million or an increase of 8.3 percent ($35 million) over the 1991-92 year. For AFDC cases, $90 million was collected while $365 million was collected for non-AFDC cases.

Through the use of income withholding, a total of $199 million was collected. That figure accounted for more than 43 percent of the collections. Another important collection source, tax-offset collections, contributed more than $21 million to the total dollars received.

During the 1992-93 year, the automated child support judgment process was initiated. Under the New Jersey statute that makes all child support arrears judgments by operation of law on the date they are due, liens are automatically placed against real property and can be used to execute against the debtor's personal property and assets. The lien created by the judgment prevents the transfer of title to the property until the debt is satisfied. That process is expected to increase collections as obligors attempt to satisfy the arrearage to avoid delaying the real-estate transaction. Since its inception in September 1992 through June 1993, judgment collections amounted to $873,665.

In addition to the judgment process, another successful enforcement technique – lottery offsets – was responsible for more than $175,000 in the 1992-93 year.

The Child Support Hearing Officer Program scheduled more that 99,000 cases in the 1992-93 court year. The state's 15 hearing officers heard more than 75,000 of those cases. Almost half the cases heard were on enforcement issues. Total cases scheduled increased by 9,000 cases over the 1991-92 court year.

IN MUNICIPAL COURTS, COMPUTERIZATION CONTINUES

Smoothly and surely, the computerization of municipal courts throughout the state continues.

The Automated Traffic System provides for the control and processing of tickets and for a full range of financial and accounting functions. As of April 30, 1994, the ATS had reached 311 courts processing 69 percent of the state's parking and traffic cases. A year earlier, the system was on-line in 234 courts processing 62 percent of those cases. The ATS backlog reduction program contributed to clearing the calendar of 106,180 cases during the 1992-93 court year.

Also expanding during the 1992-93 year was a program that grants access to the statewide ATS Traffic Warrant System to local, county, state and federal agencies. Among the agencies trained and provided access to the system were the State Police and various local police departments.

Another aspect of the computerization project is a statewide records-management system designed to ensure uniformity of municipal-court procedures. The number of courts using ATS records management climbed to 308 as of April 30, 1994, an increase of 79 courts during the year.

Although parking and traffic matters had been the focus of the ATS, a criminal-case component, ACS, was tested and is being implemented. As of April 30, 1994, 79 courts representing 16 percent of the criminal work volume in the municipal courts have been converted to the system.

A COMMITMENT TO ENDING BIAS

The New Jersey Supreme Court Task Force on Minority Concerns was the first initiative in the country established to address the issues of racial and ethnic bias in the courts.

In August 1992, after six years of work, the Task Force on released its final report, which contained 56 findings and 63 recommendations. One of the recommendations was immediately adopted when Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz announced that a permanent Supreme Court Committee on Minority Concerns would be established.

A year later, the Court announced its review of the voluminous report. In a statement released with an Action Plan to implement Task Force recommendations, the Court said:

"[T]he Report of the Task Force on Minority Concerns clearly exposes the problem of minority discrimination in the judicial system. ... In the Court's view, the most important contribution of the Task Force -- indeed, one of the main reasons for its creation -- is that has made public, in an official and credible study, the fact that discrimination against minorities affects so many aspects of the justice system. By so doing, the Task Force has energized both the public and the Judiciary to the task of addressing all aspects of the problem."

The Court further noted that it approved the report of the Task Force on Minority Concerns and regarded itself as primarily responsible for eliminating discrimination in the Judiciary. Chief Justice Wilentz, on behalf of the Court, announced the appointment of the Chairman (Superior Court Judge Harold W. Fullilove, of Essex County) and Vice-chair (Superior Court Judge Severiano Lisboa III, of Hudson County) of the new Standing Committee on Minority Concerns. To complement, at the local level, the work of the statewide committee, the court approved the establishment of Advisory Committees on Minority Concerns in each vicinage.

"Unflagging determination"

In its statement, the Court called attention to the intractable nature of discrimination in America, its historical roots, its systemic character and the need and value of a permanent group to oversee and monitor judicial reforms. The statement notes:

"It would be unrealistic to believe, given its nature, that it [discrimination] can be eliminated either in America or in our Judiciary with a mere stroke of the pen. More unrealistic, however, is the belief that it will go away by itself. Its elimination requires continued exposure, as already started by the Task Force; hard work in addressing and eliminating its specific manifestations; strong leadership and an unflagging determination to succeed; and the perseverance to keep trying in these efforts. The Court, with the help of the Standing Committee, with the help of the Judiciary, and with the support of the public, will try to accomplish these goals."

The Judiciary has already undertaken a number of measures to eliminate racial and ethnic discrimination. For example, in the area of judicial and staff education, courses on various aspects of cultural sensitivity, discrimination and diversity in the workplace are offered every year at the Judicial and Staff Colleges as well as for the staff in general.

Three initiatives in this area symbolize the Court's recognition that comprehensive and sustained efforts will be required. First, two one-day courses on minority issues have been required of all county and state judicial employees including judges; the first course was presented in 1986. The second course was initiated in mid-1992 and will continue until all court employees have completed it.

Second, approximately 140 court employees throughout the system have been selected and specially trained over a five-day period to serve as as trainers of their co-workers on cultural diversity issues and to serve as "point persons" and resource persons in areas involving cross-cultural and cross-racial relationships.

Finally, hundreds of court employees have received training over the past several years on specific cultural issues and managing cultural diversity in the workplace.

Recommended steps

Other recommendations that have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented include but are not limited to:

- establishing guidelines to monitor a minority vendor program;
- publishing a Code of Conduct for Judiciary employees;
- revising the existing code of Judicial Conduct and Rules of Professional Conduct to include the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of language.
- providing courses and seminars to enhance court employee competence in delivering services to a culturally and ethnically diverse population.
- seeking funding for the full implementation of the goals of providing qualified interpreters to all persons needing them;
- expanding the program for training court interpreters;
- planning a pilot project on developing a uniform procedure for receiving and processing discrimination complaints brought against Judiciary employees other than judges (complaints against Judges will continue to be brought to the Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct) and attorneys (complaints against attorneys will continue to be brought to the Office of Attorney Ethics);
- developing strategies to ensure the adequate representation of minorities on various Supreme Court Committees and among court volunteers;
- issuing, in each vicinage, an annual statement on racial and ethnic bias on or about Law Day; and
- continuing efforts to recruit minority law clerks and other minority employees.

Consistent with long-standing practice, matters affecting trial court procedures (such as bail and eyewitness identification, for example) and proposed rule changes have been referred to the appropriate standing Supreme Court Committees.

Copies of the Supreme Court's Statement on the Final Report of the Supreme Court Task Force on Minority Concerns and the Action Plan adopted by the Court to implement the recommendations have been distributed to all judicial employees at the state and county levels. The public may obtain copies from the Administrative Office of the Courts, Minority Concerns Unit or by visiting any court facility.

INNOVATIONS IN PROBATION: ISP AND JISP

The Intensive Supervision Program celebrated its l0th anniversary during 1993. Since its inception, ISP has proven a success in helping to abate New Jersey's prison overcrowding. Careful screening of prisoners combined with vigorous supervision has enabled the program to remain an economical alternative to Department of Corrections custody for non-violent offenders. ISP's l0th anniversary was celebrated with a number of special events, including a large-scale community-service project, a program-wide retreat and new innovative ways of supervising participants.

In June 1992, the program was the recipient of a 1991 Exemplary State and Local Award for Productivity presented by the National Center For Productivity. ISP was one of only 25 programs recognized nationally as having produced exceptional cost savings, measurable increases in quality and productivity, and improvements in the quality and effectiveness of government services.

In the 1991-92 court year, the per-participant cost of ISP remained approximately $6,300 -- compared to an estimated cost of $25,000 for each incarcerated inmate. When the value of court-ordered payments, taxes and community service is taken into account, the net cost of ISP is $3,500 per participant. ISP's average caseload during the 199l-92 and l992-93 court years was 629 participants, yielding a savings of approximately $13.5 million for the citizens of New Jersey over this period.

A recidivism study of l,560 ISP graduates was completed in September 1993. The study found that only 6.5 percent of graduates had been convicted of a new indictable offense after being in the community for an average of five years. This extremely low rate of recidivism allows ISP to conclude that the program has a lasting effect on participants.

The Governor and Legislature have recognized the economic benefits of ISP. Although the state was confronted with a severe budget deficit requiring across-the-board cutbacks in virtually every department, ISP was fully funded for the l993 fiscal year and was given an additional appropriation of $1.6 million for expansion purposes. A fourth regional office was established so that ISP could effectively manage its enlarged caseload.

During the l992-93 court year, ISP faced the challenge of expanding its caseload while under court order not to admit offenders convicted of crimes of the first and second degree. Those offenders had previously constituted about half of the ISP caseload. A legislative remedy was enacted in June 1993, which is now enabling ISP to fulfill its expansionary mandate.

ISP is always exploring new directions to keep the program viable and at the forefront of community corrections. Innovations already under way include the identification of caseloads with specialized needs and implementation of enhanced supervision strategies for those participants. Future directions include plans to implement cognitive-skills programs to improve the ability of participants to function in the community and operation of a halfway house for offenders at serious risk of program violation.

A program for juveniles

The state's budget tightens, yet juvenile justice seeks more alternatives and incarceration rates for violent delinquents increase. Can these related problems be addressed in a single stroke of legislative creativity?

The Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP) was funded by the Governor and the Legislature for the 1993 fiscal year to tackle that question. Entrusted to the Probation Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, the project is closely modeled after the successful adult program -- ISP.

JISP's key objectives are to:

- reduce the number of juvenile offenders committed in the Departments of Corrections and Human Services by 175 participants;
- utilize an imaginative array of law-enforcement techniques and social-service resources to protect the community while empowering juveniles and their families to rehabilitate independently; and
- increase the availability of correctional bed space for the most violent juvenile delinquents.

The JISP approach to handling the state's toughest juveniles is unique. If successful, it will set the standard for community supervision of delinquents while saving taxpayers the exorbitant cost of incarcerating juveniles -- roughly $37,000 per year per resident. And it shouldn't be overlooked that those savings accrue long term as well, by deterring juveniles in the program from adult criminality.

JISP combines aggressive supervision techniques with creative resource development. JISP officers work a very demanding schedule. The contacts are frequent and random. During August 1993, for example, each participant had an astounding average of 29 direct contacts with their officers and 57 telephone contacts. JISP officers also obtain the cooperation of local police departments to track the participants. Community protection ranks high as a priority.

Equally important as community supervision in JISP is its social-services component. JISP officers and community development specialists arrange help for participants who may be substance abusers, learning- or developmentally-disabled, or chronically delinquent. JISP resources focus in those areas where the need is the greatest -- high delinquency areas such as Paterson, Newark and Camden.

Community involvement lays the cornerstone for JISP. Volunteer citizens from the participant's own neighborhoods play an integral role in determining eligibility and in direct guidance to the participants in reaching their goals. As of early 1994, 1,200 hours of service each month were being provided by 400 JISP volunteers.

Thus far, most of the JISP participants are doing very well. As of early 1994, the enrollment was more than 90, with 90 percent of them enrolled in school, vocation training, or employed. Twelve percent of participants had been re-arrested. Given the harsh reality of the lives of participants, the program has to be seen as a positive step.

Some tangible returns on the community's investment in JISP have already been realized. Take community service: On average, JISP participants were performing an aggregate of more then 900 hours per month as of early 1994. Fines, penalties, and restitutions being collected increase each month. The promise of fiscal savings appears to be taking hold, along with the promise of helping troubled youths.

Judiciary Finances

The New Jersey courts require approximately $380 million to operate. On the pages that follow are:

- summaries of expenditures for the New Jersey courts by the state, by counties and by municipalities covering the 1992 (July 1991-June 1992) and 1993 (July 1992-June 1993) fiscal years;

- summaries of each county's expenditures for the Judiciary for calendar years 1991 and 1992.

Under practices in effect before state funding of the trial courts begins, the counties pay the majority of costs of the trial courts. The support staff of most of the judges, the staff doing investigative and clerical case-management tasks, and the probation staff are all on county payrolls.

The state funds all judges' salaries other than municipal court judges. It pays the expenses of the Supreme Court, the Appellate Division and the Tax Court, and virtually all of the General Equity Division. It also funds official court reporters, judicial-education programs, the expenses of the Administrative Office of the Courts (including the bulk of trial court computer expenses) and the Superior Court Clerk's Office.

Municipalities pay the direct operating costs of the municipal courts, including judges' salaries. The state supports automation, training and other activities related to the uniform administration of the municipal courts.

Revenues

During the 1992 fiscal year, the state received about $44 million in fees and other revenues outside of traffic fines. The counties received about $54.6 million from filing fees and other non-traffic sources. The municipal courts took in about $218.6 million, of which the state received about $37.3 million; the counties about $36.3 million; private recipients about $9.6 million; and the municipalities about $135.4 million.

During the 1993 fiscal year, the state received about $38.8 million in fees and other revenues outside of traffic fines. The counties received about $59 million from filing fees and other non-traffic sources. The municipal courts took in about $220.9 million, of which the state received about $38.3 million; the counties about $34.8 million; private recipients about $9.1 million; and the municipalities about $138.7 million.

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES FOR THE NEW JERSEY COURTS
STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL
1991 – 1992

	JUDICIAL SALARIES	STAFF SALARIES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
EXPENDITURES BY THE STATE				
SUPREME COURT	$810,000	$1,953,000	$680,000	$3,443,000
APPELLATE DIVISION	$3,082,000	$6,503,000	$942,000	$10,527,000
CIVIL COURT	$13,830,000	$6,099,000	$3,260,000	$23,189,000
CRIMINAL COURT	$13,046,000	$1,876,000	$2,029,000	$16,951,000
FAMILY COURT	$7,822,000	$1,604,000	$1,817,000	$11,243,000
MUNICIPAL COURT	$0	$811,000	$319,000	$1,130,000
COURT REPORTING	$0	$9,509,000	$617,000	$10,126,000
PROBATION	$0	$3,782,000	$1,085,000	$4,867,000
LEGAL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	$0	$1,203,000	$116,000	$1,319,000
INFORMATION SERVICES	$0	$4,991,000	$6,359,000	$11,350,000
FIELD OPERATIONS	$0	$2,146,000	$128,000	$2,274,000
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	$0	$3,929,000	$1,064,000	$4,993,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY THE STATE	$38,590,000	$44,406,000	$18,416,000	$101,412,000
EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES				
SUPERIOR COURT	$0	$93,785,000	$7,594,000	$101,379,000
JURY COMMISSIONERS	$0	$3,705,000	$3,260,000	$6,965,000
PROBATION DEPARTMENT	$0	$74,971,000	$4,648,000	$79,619,000
SURROGATE	$0	$7,149,000	$524,000	$7,673,000
LAW LIBRARY	$0	$412,000	$919,000	$1,331,000
COUNTY CLERK– JUDICIAL FUNCTION	$0	$16,298,000	$561,000	$16,859,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES	$0	$196,320,000	$17,506,000	$213,826,000
EXPENDITURES BY THE MUNICIPALITIES	$8,829,000	$35,117,000	$9,664,000	$53,610,000
TOTAL JUDICIARY EXPENDITURES	$47,419,000	$275,843,000	$45,586,000	$368,848,000

SOURCE: STATE EXPENDITURES PER JUDICIARY – AOC EXPENDITURE REPORTS AS OF 7/31/93.

COUNTY EXPENDITURES ON FILE WITH THE DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES IN COUNTY AUDIT REPORTS FOR CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1991.

MUNICIPAL AUDIT REPORTS ON FILE WITH THE AOC (492 OUT OF 535 MUNICIPALITIES) FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1991.

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES FOR THE NEW JERSEY COURTS
STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL
1992 – 1993

	JUDICIAL SALARIES	STAFF SALARIES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
EXPENDITURES BY THE STATE				
SUPREME COURT	$810,000	$1,977,000	$529,000	$3,316,000
APPELLATE DIVISION	$3,116,000	$6,643,000	$858,000	$10,617,000
CIVIL COURT	$15,179,000	$5,908,000	$3,232,000	$24,319,000
CRIMINAL COURT	$12,789,000	$1,617,000	$1,951,000	$16,357,000
FAMILY COURT	$8,845,000	$1,427,000	$1,986,000	$12,258,000
MUNICIPAL COURT	$0	$687,000	$84,000	$771,000
COURT REPORTING	$0	$8,585,000	$324,000	$8,909,000
PROBATION	$0	$4,292,000	$2,380,000	$6,672,000
LEGAL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	$0	$1,137,000	$100,000	$1,237,000
INFORMATION SERVICES	$0	$5,316,000	$5,502,000	$10,818,000
FIELD OPERATIONS	$0	$2,164,000	$134,000	$2,298,000
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	$0	$3,727,000	$1,023,000	$4,750,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY THE STATE	$40,739,000	$43,480,000	$18,103,000	$102,322,000
EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES				
SUPERIOR COURT	$0	$99,399,000	$7,189,000	$106,588,000
JURY COMMISSIONERS	$0	$3,644,000	$3,220,000	$6,864,000
PROBATION DEPARTMENT	$0	$73,179,000	$4,604,000	$77,783,000
SURROGATE	$0	$7,143,000	$463,000	$7,606,000
LAW LIBRARY	$0	$362,000	$1,258,000	$1,620,000
COUNTY CLERK– JUDICIAL FUNCTION	$0	$14,968,000	$438,000	$15,406,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES	$0	$198,695,000	$17,172,000	$215,867,000
EXPENDITURES BY THE MUNICIPALITIES	$9,991,000	$45,383,000	$10,285,000	$65,659,000
TOTAL JUDICIARY EXPENDITURES	$50,730,000	$287,558,000	$45,560,000	$383,848,000

SOURCE: STATE EXPENDITURES PER JUDICIARY – AOC EXPENDITURE REPORTS AS OF 7/31/93.

COUNTY EXPENDITURES ON FILE WITH THE DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES IN COUNTY AUDIT REPORTS FOR CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1992.

MUNICIPAL AUDIT REPORTS ON FILE WITH THE AOC (515 OUT OF 535 MUNICIPALITIES) FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1992.

SUMMARY OF THE EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES
FOR THE JUDICIARY
CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1991

COUNTY	SALARIES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
ATLANTIC	$6,442,000	$655,000	$7,097,000
BERGEN	$11,956,000	$1,129,000	$13,085,000
BURLINGTON	$6,291,000	$502,000	$6,793,000
CAMDEN	$15,631,000	$2,004,000	$17,635,000
CAPE MAY	$2,405,000	$387,000	$2,792,000
CUMBERLAND	$2,829,000	$502,000	$3,331,000
ESSEX	$34,999,000	$2,755,000	$37,754,000
GLOUCESTER	$5,113,000	$325,000	$5,438,000
HUDSON	$13,423,000	$1,339,000	$14,762,000
HUNTERDON	$2,041,000	$334,000	$2,375,000
MERCER	$5,409,000	$475,000	$5,884,000
MIDDLESEX	$17,431,000	$1,032,000	$18,463,000
MONMOUTH	$12,275,000	$882,000	$13,157,000
MORRIS	$8,272,000	$885,000	$9,157,000
OCEAN	$7,612,000	$608,000	$8,220,000
PASSAIC	$15,125,000	$867,000	$15,992,000
SALEM	$1,520,000	$273,000	$1,793,000
SOMERSET	$5,874,000	$813,000	$6,687,000
SUSSEX	$1,612,000	$529,000	$2,141,000
UNION	$17,639,000	$983,000	$18,622,000
WARREN	$2,421,000	$227,000	$2,648,000
TOTAL	$196,320,000	$17,506,000	$213,826,000

SOURCE: COUNTY AUDIT REPORTS ON FILE WITH THE DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES.

SUMMARY OF THE EXPENDITURES BY THE COUNTIES
FOR THE JUDICIARY
CALENDAR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1992

COUNTY	SALARIES	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
ATLANTIC	$6,788,000	$648,000	$7,436,000
BERGEN	$12,830,000	$1,216,000	$14,046,000
BURLINGTON	$6,489,000	$571,000	$7,060,000
CAMDEN	$14,486,000	$1,762,000	$16,248,000
CAPE MAY	$2,519,000	$222,000	$2,741,000
CUMBERLAND	$3,108,000	$454,000	$3,562,000
ESSEX	$27,194,000	$2,426,000	$29,620,000
GLOUCESTER	$8,691,000	$509,000	$9,200,000
HUDSON	$14,166,000	$1,419,000	$15,585,000
HUNTERDON	$2,064,000	$373,000	$2,437,000
MERCER	$6,066,000	$543,000	$6,609,000
MIDDLESEX	$17,782,000	$1,129,000	$18,911,000
MONMOUTH	$12,995,000	$864,000	$13,859,000
MORRIS	$9,059,000	$892,000	$9,951,000
OCEAN	$7,755,000	$586,000	$8,341,000
PASSAIC	$16,022,000	$881,000	$16,903,000
SALEM	$1,756,000	$351,000	$2,107,000
SOMERSET	$6,094,000	$721,000	$6,815,000
SUSSEX	$1,846,000	$444,000	$2,290,000
UNION	$18,318,000	$959,000	$19,277,000
WARREN	$2,667,000	$202,000	$2,869,000
TOTAL	$198,695,000	$17,172,000	$215,867,000

SOURCE: COUNTY AUDIT REPORTS ON FILE WITH THE DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES.

Statistics

JUDICIARY

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			ACTIVE PENDING		
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	June 92	June 93	Percent Change
Supreme Court	212	218	3	222	218	-2	133	133	0
Appellate Division	6,907	6,605	-4	6,475	6,439	-1	6,061	6,227	3
Tax Court	16,300	15,287	-6	9,224	16,027	74	19,478	18,738	-4
Trial Courts	1,015,578	968,859	-5	1,020,918	995,342	-3	326,149	302,152	-7
Municipal Courts	6,282,777	5,919,290	-6	6,645,349	6,026,753	-9	3,999,991	3,499,380	-13
Total	7,321,774	6,910,259	-6	7,682,188	7,044,779	-8	4,351,812	3,826,630	-12

SUPREME COURT

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			ACTIVE PENDING		
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	June 92	June 93	Percent Change
Appeals	212	218	3	222	218	-2	133	133	0
Certifications	1,261	1,256	-0	1,329	1,242	-7	269	283	5
Motions	1,627	1,519	-7	1,653	1,564	-5	114	69	-39
Disciplinaries	195	171	-12	203	173	-15	38	36	-5
Total	3,295	3,164	-4	3,407	3,197	-6	554	521	-6

MUNICIPAL COURTS

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			ACTIVE PENDING		
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	June 92	June 93	Percent Change
Criminal	590,898	661,989	-4	675,391	643,480	-5	170,343	164,158	-4
D.W.I.	46,159	42,448	-8	44,767	43,358	-3	11,630	9,708	-17
Moving	2,193,385	2,077,307	-5	2,186,810	2,070,861	-5	440,062	376,243	-15
Parking	3,352,335	3,137,546	-6	3,738,381	3,269,054	-13	3,377,956	2,949,271	-13
Total	6,282,777	5,919,290	-6	6,645,349	6,026,753	-9	3,999,991	3,499,380	-13

PROBATION

	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change
Adult Supervision:			
Persons Supervised	70,223	71,018	1
Average Caseload	169	175	4
Juvenile Supervision:			
Persons Supervised	12,678	12,470	-2
Average Caseload	78	85	9
Community Service:			
Participants	35,571	38,759	9
Hours of Service (In 1,000's)	1,816	1,792	-1
Child Support Collections:			
AFDC (In 1,000's)	$87,942	$89,551	2
Non AFDC (In 1,000's)	$328,716	$364,643	11
Hearing Officer Dispositions	72,029	75,953	5
Intensive Supervision:			
Average Caseload	612	646	6
Completed Program	224	255	14

Statistics

Superior Courts

STATE

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	51,054	47,958	-6	57,145	49,227	-14	6,091	1,269	17,232	16,469	-4	449	442	502	454
Civil	157,075	139,809	-11	151,329	159,248	5	-5,746	19,439	199,121	181,526	-9	1,552	1,183	1,495	1,347
General Equity	7,703	6,833	-11	7,919	7,342	-7	216	509	4,281	3,747	-12	445	366	457	393
Special Civil	433,203	426,061	-2	441,630	428,304	-3	8,427	2,243	42,311	40,351	-5	26,255	25,728	26,765	25,864
Family	357,432	339,986	-5	353,685	343,031	-3	-3,747	3,045	60,943	57,765	-5	4,218	3,659	4,174	3,691
Dissolution	55,462	54,064	-3	53,637	54,819	2	-1,825	755	20,834	20,145	-3	-	1,306	-	1,324
Delinquency	99,708	92,048	-8	100,072	93,453	-7	364	1,405	14,657	13,439	-8	-	5,046	-	5,124
Non-Dissolution	133,366	120,652	-10	131,834	121,389	-8	-1,532	737	11,843	10,819	-9	-	9,106	-	9,161
Domestic Violence	48,492	53,321	10	47,768	52,886	11	-724	-435	1,864	2,253	21	-	3,912	-	3,880
Other Family	20,404	19,901	-2	20,374	20,484	1	-30	583	11,745	11,109	-5	-	3,105	-	3,196
Miscellaneous	9,111	8,212	-10	9,210	8,190	-11	99	-22	2,261	2,294	1	2,336	2,326	2,362	2,320
Total	1,015,578	968,859	-5	1,020,918	995,342	-3	5,340	26,483	326,149	302,152	-7	3,009	2,703	3,025	2,777

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

ATLANTIC

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	5,319	4,478	-16	5,273	4,303	-18	-46	-175	810	831	3	1,122	935	1,112	898
Civil	7,370	6,147	-17	7,994	6,724	-16	624	577	5,800	5,280	-9	1,558	1,222	1,690	1,337
General Equity	405	377	-7	416	331	-20	11	-46	162	210	30	358	314	368	276
Special Civil	18,024	18,141	1	18,543	18,174	-2	519	33	1,816	1,784	-2	-	35,571	-	35,635
Family	14,083	15,142	8	13,676	15,234	11	-407	92	1,912	1,912	0	4,347	3,843	4,221	3,866
Dissolution	2,169	2,194	1	2,041	2,229	9	-128	35	595	561	-6	-	1,030	-	1,046
Delinquency	5,456	5,783	6	5,300	5,803	9	-156	20	460	443	-4	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	4,010	4,542	13	3,862	4,527	17	-148	-15	416	436	5	-	7,446	-	7,421
Domestic Violence	1,847	2,029	10	1,841	1,998	9	-6	-31	48	79	65	-	3,828	-	3,770
Other Family	601	594	-1	632	677	7	31	83	393	393	0	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	337	396	18	332	378	14	-5	-18	64	81	27	-	-	-	-
Total	45,538	44,681	-2	46,234	45,144	-2	696	463	10,564	10,098	-4	3,187	2,872	3,235	2,901

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

BERGEN

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	2,641	2,496	-5	2,550	2,478	-3	-91	-18	953	960	1	397	360	383	357
Civil	17,024	15,387	-10	17,488	16,795	-4	464	1,408	16,921	15,707	-7	1,301	1,131	1,336	1,235
General Equity	814	782	-4	799	815	2	-15	33	560	542	-3	465	437	457	455
Special Civil	38,830	38,605	-1	39,459	38,774	-2	629	169	2,279	2,110	-7	18,758	19,899	19,062	19,987
Family	19,445	21,023	8	20,064	21,327	6	619	304	2,877	2,575	-10	2,847	2,586	2,938	2,623
Dissolution	5,218	6,023	15	5,282	6,122	16	64	99	1,892	1,793	-5	-	1,495	-	1,519
Delinquency	4,824	4,668	-3	4,873	4,716	-3	49	48	345	297	-14	-	5,245	-	5,299
Non-Dissolution	5,064	5,070	0	5,150	5,169	0	86	99	198	99	-50	-	3,596	-	3,666
Domestic Violence	3,151	3,764	19	3,201	3,807	19	50	43	135	92	-32	-	2,747	-	2,779
Other Family	1,188	1,498	26	1,558	1,513	-3	370	15	307	294	-4	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	1,343	1,208	-10	1,388	1,141	-18	45	-67	302	369	22	-	-	-	-
Total	80,097	79,501	-1	81,748	81,330	-1	1,651	1,829	23,892	22,263	-7	2,599	2,431	2,652	2,487

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

BURLINGTON

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,115	905	-19	1,303	1,045	-20	188	140	384	268	-30	394	324	460	375
Civil	5,593	4,757	-15	5,335	5,053	-5	-258	296	6,479	6,218	-4	1,764	1,355	1,683	1,440
General Equity	342	292	-15	455	351	-23	113	59	166	107	-36	323	292	429	351
Special Civil	15,510	15,607	1	16,239	15,074	-7	729	-533	1,514	1,996	32	-	-	-	-
Family	16,572	16,911	2	16,120	16,616	3	-452	-295	3,367	3,672	9	5,506	4,988	5,355	4,901
. Dissolution	3,232	3,136	-3	3,095	2,961	-4	-137	-175	1,343	1,521	13	-	1,537	-	1,451
Delinquency	2,790	2,968	6	2,724	3,176	17	-66	208	807	611	-24	-	5,936	-	6,352
Non-Dissolution	7,612	7,690	1	7,521	7,428	-1	-91	-262	563	822	46	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	2,080	2,333	12	1,986	2,327	17	-94	-6	170	175	3	-	-	-	-
Other Family	858	784	-9	794	724	-9	-64	-60	484	543	12	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	372	340	-9	463	365	-21	91	25	145	126	-13	-	-	-	-
Total	39,504	38,812	-2	39,915	38,504	-4	411	-308	12,055	12,387	3	3,741	3,456	3,780	3,429

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

CAMDEN

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	3,463	3,386	-2	3,431	3,234	-6	-32	-152	1,139	1,347	18	510	587	505	560
Civil	14,292	13,009	-9	14,280	14,056	-2	-12	1,047	16,404	15,473	-6	1,475	1,393	1,474	1,505
General Equity	384	327	-15	345	332	-4	-39	5	228	216	-5	388	321	348	325
Special Civil	24,545	24,067	-2	26,012	25,265	-3	1,467	1,198	3,117	2,368	-24	-	-	-	-
Family	29,213	28,921	-1	28,777	28,597	-1	-436	-324	3,380	3,733	10	4,727	4,382	4,656	4,333
Dissolution	3,413	3,178	-7	3,201	3,266	2	-212	88	1,351	1,262	-7	-	1,070	-	1,100
Delinquency	6,897	7,108	3	6,985	6,853	-2	88	-255	379	645	70	-	4,707	-	4,538
Non-Dissolution	12,827	12,830	0	12,610	12,752	1	-217	-78	600	694	16	-	19,439	-	19,321
Domestic Violence	3,992	3,769	-6	3,965	3,721	-6	-27	-48	95	144	52	-	4,142	-	4,089
Other Family	2,084	2,036	-2	2,016	2,005	-1	-68	-31	955	988	3	-	3,702	-	3,645
Miscellaneous	423	402	-5	451	391	-13	28	-11	168	179	7	-	-	-	-
Total	72,320	70,112	-3	73,296	71,875	-2	976	1,763	24,436	23,316	-5	2,992	3,004	3,033	3,079

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

CAPE MAY

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	971	805	-17	961	775	-19	-10	-30	162	167	3	916	875	907	842
Civil	1,494	1,237	-17	1,557	1,334	-14	63	97	1,192	1,098	-8	1,509	1,275	1,573	1,375
General Equity	200	151	-24	199	158	-21	-1	7	110	99	-10	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	5,283	4,920	-7	5,320	5,028	-5	37	108	588	480	-18	-	-	-	-
Family	6,283	5,817	-7	6,356	5,646	-11	73	-171	651	911	40	5,511	5,337	5,575	5,180
Dissolution	999	961	-4	969	956	-1	-30	-5	212	232	9	-	1,780	-	1,770
Delinquency	1,904	1,763	-7	2,057	1,724	-16	153	-39	115	213	85	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	2,174	1,852	-15	2,155	1,722	-20	-19	-130	106	246	132	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	878	926	5	854	910	7	-24	-16	30	51	70	-	-	-	-
Other Family	328	315	-4	321	334	4	-7	19	188	169	-10	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	170	181	6	165	179	8	-5	-2	44	46	5	-	-	-	-
Total	14,401	13,111	-9	14,558	13,120	-10	157	9	2,747	2,801	2	3,861	4,022	3,903	4,025

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

CUMBERLAND

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,625	1,610	-1	1,901	1,526	-20	276	-84	443	516	16	602	548	704	519
Civil	2,272	1,999	-12	2,155	2,173	1	-117	174	2,647	2,479	-6	1,546	1,155	1,466	1,256
General Equity	89	88	-1	95	118	24	6	30	89	54	-39	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	7,113	7,694	8	7,284	7,595	4	171	-99	875	974	11	-	-	-	-
Family	13,898	15,286	10	14,406	15,399	7	508	113	2,308	2,143	-7	7,315	7,961	7,582	8,020
Dissolution	979	1,092	12	1,041	1,043	0	62	-49	555	552	-1	-	1,300	-	1,242
Delinquency	3,486	4,146	19	3,379	4,103	21	-107	-43	695	738	6	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	6,755	6,679	-1	7,289	6,873	-6	534	194	557	363	-35	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	2,131	2,733	28	2,074	2,704	30	-57	-29	84	113	35	-	-	-	-
Other Family	547	636	16	623	676	9	76	40	417	377	-10	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	164	165	1	168	157	-7	4	-8	18	26	44	-	-	-	-
Total	25,161	26,842	7	26,009	26,968	4	848	126	6,380	6,192	-3	3,938	3,959	4,070	3,978

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

ESSEX

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	9,125	7,244	-21	11,175	7,747	-31	2,050	503	2,531	2,298	-9	388	324	475	346
Civil	21,065	19,169	-9	18,967	28,090	48	-2,098	8,921	33,347	25,075	-25	2,199	1,267	1,980	1,857
General Equity	702	584	-17	754	613	-19	52	29	400	356	-11	248	194	266	204
Special Civil	75,690	77,526	2	75,103	76,691	2	-587	-835	6,874	7,674	12	20,457	23,493	20,298	23,240
Family	53,726	41,239	-23	54,102	42,084	-22	376	845	7,658	6,783	-11	4,305	2,838	4,335	2,896
Dissolution	4,013	3,630	-10	4,001	3,943	-1	-12	313	2,160	1,897	-12	-	667	-	725
Delinquency	19,055	15,686	-18	19,616	16,258	-17	561	572	2,327	1,770	-24	-	4,711	-	4,882
Non-Dissolution	22,561	14,250	-37	22,353	14,098	-37	-208	-152	666	726	9	-	3,926	-	3,884
Domestic Violence	5,010	5,222	4	5,010	5,113	2	0	-109	115	245	113	-	4,246	-	4,157
Other Family	3,087	2,451	-21	3,122	2,672	-14	35	221	2,390	2,145	-10	-	2,723	-	2,969
Miscellaneous	624	631	1	641	571	-11	17	-60	124	183	48	879	901	903	816
Total	160,932	146,393	-9	160,742	155,796	-3	-190	9,403	50,934	42,369	-17	3,046	2,480	3,042	2,639

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

OCEAN

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,858	1,729	-7	1,971	1,828	-7	113	99	678	509	-25	485	451	515	477
Civil	6,462	5,329	-18	6,473	6,363	-2	11	1,034	7,556	6,536	-13	1,156	731	1,158	873
General Equity	523	494	-6	556	530	-5	33	36	313	277	-12	758	772	806	828
Special Civil	19,775	18,421	-7	20,170	18,758	-7	395	337	2,773	2,436	-12	26,367	24,893	26,893	25,349
Family	14,717	14,935	1	14,006	15,300	9	-711	365	3,373	3,017	-11	5,200	4,255	4,949	4,359
Dissolution	3,284	3,104	-5	3,207	3,107	-3	-77	3	1,028	1,026	0	-	1,826	-	1,828
Delinquency	4,613	4,496	-3	4,317	4,647	8	-296	151	902	744	-18	-	6,244	-	6,454
Non-Dissolution	3,357	3,497	4	3,225	3,512	9	-132	15	756	741	-2	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	2,264	3,117	38	2,192	3,152	44	-72	35	91	71	-22	-	5,110	-	5,167
Other Family	1,199	721	-40	1,065	882	-17	-134	161	596	435	-27	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	747	681	-9	827	722	-13	80	41	250	211	-16	-	-	-	-
Total	44,082	41,589	-6	44,003	43,501	-1	-79	1,912	14,943	12,986	-13	3,138	2,541	3,132	2,657

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

GLOUCESTER

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,174	870	-26	1,291	1,194	-8	117	324	483	304	-37	638	422	702	580
Civil	3,232	2,828	-13	3,613	2,968	-18	381	140	3,481	3,354	-4	1,253	1,154	1,400	1,211
General Equity	176	166	-6	158	166	5	-18	0	101	98	-3	309	221	277	221
Special Civil	9,458	9,133	-3	9,754	9,174	-6	296	41	924	885	-4	12,611	12,342	13,005	12,397
Family	12,542	12,372	-1	12,361	12,002	-3	-181	-370	1,615	1,880	16	6,088	5,920	6,000	5,743
Dissolution	2,127	2,144	1	2,110	2,017	-4	-17	-127	543	670	23	-	1,757	-	1,653
Delinquency	2,234	2,038	-9	2,338	2,135	-9	104	97	251	153	-39	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	5,559	5,244	-6	5,374	4,926	-8	-185	-318	458	671	47	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	2,010	2,158	7	2,008	2,155	7	-2	-3	10	13	30	-	-	-	-
Other Family	612	788	29	531	769	45	-81	-19	353	373	6	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	220	218	-1	228	218	-4	8	0	58	59	2	-	-	-	-
Total	26,802	25,587	-5	27,405	25,722	-6	603	135	6,662	6,580	-1	3,371	3,140	3,447	3,156

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

HUDSON

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	3,822	4,692	23	4,396	4,220	-4	574	-472	1,492	1,790	20	323	473	372	425
Civil	12,455	11,691	-6	11,635	12,079	4	-820	388	14,320	14,055	-2	1,834	1,771	1,714	1,830
General Equity	480	485	1	509	539	6	29	54	251	187	-25	432	453	459	504
Special Civil	40,935	41,793	2	41,831	41,809	0	896	16	3,613	3,597	0	23,799	21,654	24,320	21,663
Family	29,296	28,307	-3	29,433	28,583	-3	137	276	3,792	3,520	-7	4,439	3,534	4,460	3,568
Dissolution	3,413	3,503	3	3,628	3,576	-1	215	73	1,163	1,092	-6	-	2,305	-	2,353
Delinquency	9,112	7,972	-13	8,962	8,066	-10	-150	94	880	793	-10	-	3,336	-	3,375
Non-Dissolution	11,488	10,889	-5	11,611	10,908	-6	123	19	654	639	-2	-	7,891	-	7,904
Domestic Violence	3,931	4,507	15	3,836	4,511	18	-95	4	222	217	-2	-	2,561	-	2,563
Other Family	1,352	1,436	6	1,396	1,522	9	44	86	873	779	-11	-	1,496	-	1,585
Miscellaneous	588	468	-20	501	467	-7	-87	-1	187	188	1	-	-	-	-
Total	87,576	87,436	0	88,305	87,697	-1	729	261	23,655	23,337	-1	3,104	3,157	3,130	3,166

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 199[illegible] court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

HUNTERDON

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	308	284	-8	268	308	15	-40	24	96	78	-19	560	394	487	428
Civil	1,071	819	-24	1,275	909	-29	204	90	900	815	-9	729	598	867	664
General Equity	135	114	-16	129	138	7	-6	24	67	49	-27	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	2,955	2,570	-13	3,139	2,662	-15	184	92	456	364	-20	-	-	-	-
Family	2,396	2,355	-2	2,276	2,487	9	-120	132	513	382	-26	2,496	2,479	2,371	2,618
Dissolution	939	825	-12	849	870	2	-90	45	307	262	-15	-	1,196	-	1,261
Delinquency	436	363	-17	405	401	-1	-31	38	87	49	-44	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	537	646	20	535	662	24	-2	16	36	20	-44	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	341	390	14	335	401	20	-6	11	17	6	-65	-	-	-	-
Other Family	143	131	-8	152	153	1	9	22	66	45	-32	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	121	122	1	126	118	-6	5	-4	27	31	15	-	-	-	-
Total	6,986	6,264	-10	7,213	6,622	-8	227	358	2,059	1,719	-17	2,143	1,892	2,213	2,001

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

MERCER

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	2,187	2,392	9	2,296	2,656	16	109	264	1,551	1,232	-21	357	382	375	424
Civil	5,985	6,092	2	5,811	5,551	-4	-174	-541	8,556	8,869	4	1,825	1,475	1,772	1,344
General Equity	405	340	-16	426	338	-21	21	-2	100	92	-8	623	425	655	423
Special Civil	16,558	16,949	2	16,596	17,032	3	38	83	1,545	1,521	-2	21,504	24,564	21,553	24,684
Family	17,742	17,481	-1	16,087	18,262	14	-1,655	781	7,481	6,672	-11	3,951	3,719	3,583	3,886
Dissolution	1,836	1,940	6	1,668	1,943	16	-168	3	995	990	-1	-	1,066	-	1,068
Delinquency	5,051	5,297	5	5,216	5,370	3	165	73	2,304	2,251	-2	-	5,245	-	5,317
Non-Dissolution	7,369	6,616	-10	6,012	7,269	21	-1,357	653	2,970	2,318	-22	-	8,592	-	9,440
Domestic Violence	2,233	2,497	12	2,088	2,508	20	-145	11	252	243	-4	-	3,045	-	3,059
Other Family	1,253	1,131	-10	1,103	1,172	6	-150	41	960	870	-9	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	366	348	-5	340	336	-1	-26	-12	67	85	27	-	-	-	-
Total	43,243	43,602	1	41,556	44,175	6	-1,687	573	19,300	18,471	-4	2,799	2,605	2,690	2,639

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

MIDDLESEX

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	3,942	4,225	7	4,692	4,439	-5	750	214	1,750	1,830	5	416	444	495	467
Civil	14,467	13,071	-10	12,832	14,898	16	-1,635	1,827	21,987	20,778	-5	1,297	958	1,151	1,091
General Equity	587	514	-12	556	600	8	-31	86	472	386	-18	356	292	337	341
Special Civil	32,250	30,748	-5	32,614	30,745	-6	364	-3	2,246	2,241	0	29,587	24,998	29,921	24,996
Family	20,889	20,264	-3	21,053	20,343	-3	164	79	4,819	4,736	-2	3,464	3,191	3,491	3,204
Dissolution	5,048	4,490	-11	4,821	4,650	-4	-227	160	1,968	1,799	-9	-	1,863	-	1,929
Delinquency	6,299	6,299	0	6,433	6,291	-2	134	-8	1,365	1,373	1	-	3,772	-	3,767
Non-Dissolution	5,550	5,044	-9	5,827	5,009	-14	277	-35	877	922	5	-	8,549	-	8,490
Domestic Violence	2,943	3,037	3	2,948	3,000	2	5	-37	16	50	213	-	2,761	-	2,727
Other Family	1,049	1,394	33	1,024	1,393	36	-25	-1	593	592	0	-	2,403	-	2,402
Miscellaneous	587	541	-8	557	555	0	-30	14	119	101	-15	-	-	-	-
Total	72,722	69,363	-5	72,304	71,580	-1	-418	2,217	31,393	30,072	-4	2,465	2,129	2,451	2,197

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

MORRIS

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,760	1,623	-8	2,317	1,787	-23	557	164	234	160	-32	506	492	666	542
Civil	6,120	5,076	-17	5,791	5,989	3	-329	913	8,764	7,874	-10	1,366	884	1,293	1,043
General Equity	470	435	-7	474	452	-5	4	17	237	215	-9	443	382	447	396
Special Civil	18,566	17,195	-7	17,843	17,631	-1	-723	436	2,219	1,783	-20	-	30,167	-	30,932
Family	10,312	10,377	1	10,271	10,530	3	-41	153	1,743	1,598	-8	2,104	2,391	2,096	2,426
Dissolution	3,152	2,899	-8	2,938	2,944	0	-214	45	969	927	-4	-	986	-	1,001
Delinquency	2,378	2,408	1	2,441	2,423	-1	63	15	199	190	-5	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	2,058	2,562	24	2,203	2,586	17	145	24	178	155	-13	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	1,969	1,841	-7	1,934	1,837	-5	-35	-4	46	50	9	-	3,610	-	3,602
Other Family	755	667	-12	755	740	-2	0	73	351	276	-21	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	570	492	-14	573	511	-11	3	19	111	88	-21	-	-	-	-
Total	37,798	35,198	-7	37,269	36,900	-1	-529	1,702	13,308	11,718	-12	2,596	2,305	2,560	2,417

NOTE: 1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

MONMOUTH

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	2,587	2,611	1	2,786	2,871	3	199	260	1,570	1,307	-17	397	385	427	423
Civil	9,741	8,188	-16	9,575	9,188	-4	-166	1,000	14,356	13,416	-7	1,541	1,034	1,515	1,160
General Equity	731	578	-21	725	651	-10	-6	73	467	399	-15	902	474	895	534
Special Civil	30,111	28,584	-5	30,906	28,895	-7	795	311	2,605	2,295	-12	-	39,156	-	39,582
Family	26,126	26,415	1	26,919	26,922	0	793	507	4,276	3,784	-12	3,876	4,083	3,994	4,161
Dissolution	4,836	4,529	-6	4,952	4,609	-7	116	80	1,561	1,483	-5	-	1,283	-	1,306
Delinquency	7,531	5,581	-26	8,025	5,929	-26	494	348	9[illegible]	672	-33	-	5,637	-	5,989
Non-Dissolution	8,742	10,572	21	8,886	10,611	19	144	39	601	555	-8	-	21,144	-	21,222
Domestic Violence	3,384	4,153	23	3,406	4,159	22	22	6	156	152	-3	-	5,464	-	5,472
Other Family	1,633	1,580	-3	1,650	1,614	-2	17	34	961	922	-4	-	2,290	-	2,339
Miscellaneous	778	732	-6	784	760	-3	6	28	96	68	-29	-	-	-	-
Total	70,074	67,108	-4	71,695	69,287	-3	1,621	2,179	23,370	21,269	-9	3,315	2,867	3,391	2,960

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

OCEAN

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	1,858	1,729	-7	1,971	1,828	-7	113	99	678	509	-25	485	451	515	477
Civil	6,462	5,329	-18	6,473	6,363	-2	11	1,034	7,556	6,536	-13	1,156	731	1,158	873
General Equity	523	494	-6	556	530	-5	33	36	313	277	-12	758	772	806	828
Special Civil	19,775	18,421	-7	20,170	18,758	-7	395	337	2,773	2,436	-12	26,367	24,893	26,893	25,349
Family	14,717	14,935	1	14,006	15,300	9	-711	365	3,373	3,017	-11	5,200	4,255	4,949	4,359
Dissolution	3,284	3,104	-5	3,207	3,107	-3	-77	3	1,028	1,026	0	-	1,826	-	1,828
Delinquency	4,613	4,496	-3	4,317	4,647	8	-296	151	902	744	-18	-	6,244	-	6,454
Non-Dissolution	3,357	3,497	4	3,225	3,512	9	-132	15	756	741	-2	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	2,264	3,117	38	2,192	3,152	44	-72	35	91	71	-22	-	5,110	-	5,167
Other Family	1,199	721	-40	1,065	882	-17	-134	161	596	435	-27	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	747	681	-9	827	722	-13	80	41	250	211	-16	-	-	-	-
Total	44,082	41,589	-6	44,003	43,501	-1	-79	1,912	14,943	12,986	-13	3,138	2,541	3,132	2,657

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

PASSAIC

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	3,243	2,947	-9	3,337	2,778	-17	94	-169	1,059	1,217	15	367	408	378	384
Civil	12,771	11,321	-11	11,336	10,973	-3	-1,435	-348	17,201	17,643	3	1,986	1,881	1,763	1,823
General Equity	365	321	-12	381	345	-9	16	24	183	157	-14	445	297	465	319
Special Civil	28,504	26,630	-7	29,122	27,094	-7	618	464	2,351	1,887	-20	20,073	22,008	20,508	22,392
Family	27,481	20,827	-24	25,976	21,375	-18	-1,505	548	4,656	3,917	-16	6,543	4,191	6,185	4,301
Dissolution	2,911	3,190	10	2,484	3,178	28	-427	-12	1,459	1,521	4	-	1,541	-	1,535
Delinquency	6,983	5,231	-25	6,632	5,286	-20	-351	55	882	866	-2	-	4,253	-	4,298
Non-Dissolution	12,636	7,936	-37	12,073	8,863	-27	-563	927	1,557	501	-68	-	14,171	-	15,827
Domestic Violence	4,265	3,619	-15	4,135	3,350	-19	-130	-269	200	356	78	-	3,977	-	3,681
Other Family	686	851	24	652	698	7	-34	-153	558	673	21	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	364	396	9	391	392	0	27	-4	145	150	3	-	-	-	-
Total	72,728	62,442	-14	70,543	62,957	-11	-2,185	515	25,595	24,971	-2	3,313	3,011	3,214	3,036

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

SALEM

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	877	770	-12	878	730	-17	1	-40	167	251	50	877	811	878	768
Civil	517	425	-18	476	464	-3	-41	39	623	589	-5	-	-	-	-
General Equity	42	29	-31	46	38	-17	4	9	33	24	-27	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	2,312	2,464	7	2,290	2,432	6	-22	-32	276	308	12	-	-	-	-
Family	5,373	5,382	0	5,304	5,361	1	-69	-21	821	832	1	6,978	6,644	6,888	6,619
Dissolution	521	497	-5	528	427	-19	7	-70	199	261	31	-	-	-	-
Delinquency	1,266	1,183	-7	1,226	1,109	-10	-40	-74	155	229	48	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	2,693	2,668	-1	2,697	2,768	3	4	100	236	136	-42	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	540	667	24	521	659	26	-19	-8	36	44	22	-	-	-	-
Other Family	353	367	4	332	398	20	-21	31	195	162	-17	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	67	60	-10	64	66	3	-3	6	25	21	-16	-	-	-	-
Total	9,188	9,130	-1	9,058	9,091	0	-130	-39	1,945	2,025	4	4,084	4,4[illegible]	4,026	4,456

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

SOMERSET

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	809	625	-23	836	657	-21	27	32	179	156	-13	356	324	368	340
Civil	3,149	2,835	-10	3,198	3,122	-2	49	287	3,381	3,106	-8	1,307	1,086	1,327	1,196
General Equity	246	217	-12	231	249	8	-15	32	122	93	-24	456	282	428	323
Special Civil	9,299	9,133	-2	9,486	9,109	-4	187	-24	1,619	1,463	-10	-	-	-	-
Family	6,718	6,265	-7	6,441	6,421	0	-277	156	1,233	1,077	-13	3,732	3,117	3,578	3,195
Dissolution	2,342	1,853	-21	2,212	1,894	-14	-130	41	712	671	-6	-	1,597	-	1,633
Delinquency	1,314	1,195	-9	1,241	1,253	1	-73	58	164	106	-35	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	1,441	1,432	-1	1,404	1,462	4	-37	30	128	98	-23	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	1,048	1,322	26	1,024	1,325	29	-24	3	36	33	-8	-	-	-	-
Other Family	573	463	-19	560	487	-13	-13	24	193	169	-12	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	175	202	15	156	196	26	-19	-6	49	55	12	-	-	-	-
Total	20,396	19,277	-5	20,348	19,754	-3	-48	477	6,583	5,950	-10	2,730	2,446	2,724	2,507

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

SUSSEX

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	329	325	-1	296	371	25	-33	46	156	107	-31	374	374	336	426
Civil	1,170	1,115	-5	1,304	1,246	-4	134	131	1,648	1,515	-8	1,330	808	1,482	903
General Equity	161	139	-14	183	148	-19	22	9	76	65	-14	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	4,985	4,870	-2	5,451	5,077	-7	466	207	741	534	-28	-	-	-	-
Family	4,729	4,909	4	4,583	5,080	11	-146	171	961	809	-16	3,195	2,821	3,097	2,920
Dissolution	1,125	1,089	-3	1,051	1,144	9	-74	55	536	482	-10	-	1,078	-	1,133
Delinquency	906	942	4	881	1,020	16	-25	78	105	27	-74	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	1,097	1,174	7	1,055	1,190	13	-42	16	110	94	-15	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	1,166	1,258	8	1,152	1,252	9	-14	-6	36	63	75	-	-	-	-
Other Family	435	446	3	444	474	7	9	28	174	143	-18	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	134	141	5	124	124	0	-10	-17	46	66	43	-	-	-	-
Total	11,508	11,499	0	11,941	12,046	1	433	547	3,628	3,096	-15	3,345	2,738	3,471	2,868

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

UNION

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	3,381	3,589	6	4,575	3,601	-21	1,194	12	986	1,054	7	443	487	599	489
Civil	10,010	8,583	-14	9,398	10,493	12	-612	1,910	12,777	10,911	-15	1,666	988	1,564	1,207
General Equity	359	328	-9	387	331	-14	28	3	100	98	-2	264	250	285	253
Special Civil	29,312	28,179	-4	31,176	28,344	-9	1,864	165	3,551	3,384	-5	38,068	44,030	40,488	44,288
Family	21,709	21,788	0	21,312	21,413	0	-397	-375	2,937	3,300	12	3,612	3,437	3,546	3,377
Dissolution	3,154	3,091	-2	2,868	3,217	12	-286	126	1,046	915	-13	-	1,257	-	1,308
Delinquency	6,352	6,248	-2	6,257	6,174	-1	-95	-74	1,098	1,166	6	-	3,741	-	3,697
Non-Dissolution	8,092	7,830	-3	8,152	7,399	-9	60	-431	110	543	394	-	8,898	-	8,408
Domestic Violence	2,640	3,234	22	2,598	3,248	25	-42	14	55	40	-27	-	3,234	-	3,248
Other Family	1,471	1,385	-6	1,437	1,375	-4	-34	-10	628	636	1	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	845	359	-58	810	410	-49	-35	51	176	125	-29	-	-	-	-
Total	65,616	62,826	-4	67,658	64,592	-5	2,042	1,766	20,527	18,872	-8	2,973	2,546	3,066	2,617

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

WARREN

	FILINGS			TERMINATIONS			CLEARANCE		ACTIVE PENDING			FILINGS PER JUDGE		TERMINATIONS PER JUDGE	
	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	June 92	June 93	Percent Change	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93	July 91 To June 92	July 92 To June 93
Criminal	518	352	-32	612	679	11	94	327	409	87	-79	425	284	502	548
Civil	815	731	-10	836	780	-7	21	49	781	735	-6	1,101	812	1,130	867
General Equity	87	72	-17	95	99	4	8	27	44	23	-48	-	-	-	-
Special Civil	3,188	2,832	-11	3,292	2,941	-11	104	109	329	267	-19	-	-	-	-
Family	4,182	3,970	-5	4,162	4,049	-3	-20	79	570	512	-10	3,837	3,817	3,818	3,893
Dissolution	751	696	-7	691	723	5	-60	27	240	228	-5	-	1,392	-	1,446
Delinquency	821	673	-18	764	716	-6	-57	43	140	103	-26	-	-	-	-
Non-Dissolution	1,744	1,629	-7	1,840	1,655	-10	96	26	66	40	-39	-	-	-	-
Domestic Violence	669	745	11	660	749	13	-9	4	14	16	14	-	-	-	-
Other Family	197	227	15	207	206	0	10	-21	110	125	14	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous	116	129	11	121	133	10	5	4	40	36	-10	-	-	-	-
Total	8,906	8,086	-9	9,118	8,681	-5	212	595	2,173	1,660	-24	2,635	2,364	2,698	2,538

NOTE:
1) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not presented where there is less than a half of a full time equivalent judge for a specific calendar.
2) Filings per judge and terminations per judge data is not available for 1992 Family Division calendars.
3) New forms and instructions were instituted in the 1992 court year for the Family Division.
As a result, Family Division statistics in this report are not comparable with Family Division statistics in prior annual reports.

The 1991-92/1992-93 Annual Report of the New Jersey Judiciary/Administrative Office of the Courts is published in accordance with *N.J.S.A.* 2A:12-5, and is distributed as outlined in the Statute.

This Report is published by the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Media and Publications Services, Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex, CN-037, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.